

REMARKS

The following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated May 3, 2005. Claims 5 and 7-9 are pending in this application. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). No new matter has been added. Claims 5 and 7-9 are presented for reconsideration.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cupps et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,739, "Cupps") in view of Bellesfield et al. (Publication No. US 2002/0038180 A1, "Bellesfield"). In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that the combination of these two references teaches and/or suggests the claimed invention. The Office Action also asserts that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references. Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 7 and 9, as amended, recite in part:

...and displays a map image on which the destination and retrieved shops are respectively indicated with landmarks,...

The Office Action admits that Cupps fails to teach or suggest displaying a map image on which the destination and retrieved shops are indicated. The Office Action cites Bellesfield as correcting this deficiency in Cupps.

Bellesfield teaches methods and apparatus for displaying a travel route and/or generating a list of places of interest located near the travel route. This reference discloses an automated travel planning apparatus that includes three separate databases: a map database for storing bit-mapped images; a routing database for

storing node, link, and shape data for roads located within the geographic regions and for storing place data indicating the geographic location of places such as towns and cities; and a places of interest database containing the geographic locations of numerous places of interest.

In Bellesfield, a search of the places of interest database displays a list of places near the designated route. The list of places, however, does not result in the locations of the places of interest being displayed on the map. The places of interest database 34 is organized with the data structure shown in Figure 7. This data structure contains both places of interest data and geographic center data. The places of interest data includes a field for place name and geographic center. The place name contains the name of a place of interest, such as a hotel, restaurant, attraction, etc. Each place name is associated with a geographic center such as a city. A geographic center for a given place of interest is generally the city in which the place of interest is most commonly associated. This data structure effectively groups places of interest based on geographic location by “geocoding” each place of interest to the latitude/longitude of a geographic center located near the place of interest. Accordingly, Bellesfield teaches displaying the beginning and end points of a route but fails to display the actual locations of the places of interest on the map. The places of interest are only displayed on a list associated with the map.

Accordingly, the combination of Cupps and Bellesfield fails to disclose and/or suggest a “a map image on which the destination and retrieved shops are respectively indicated with landmarks.” Consequently, the combination of these two references fails to teach that “a shop is selected based on the map image”.

Therefore, the combination of Cupps and Bellesfield fails to disclose and/or suggest Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicants' remarks have overcome the rejection set forth in the Office Action dated November 4, 2004. Specifically, Applicants' remarks have distinguished claims 5 and 7-9 from the combination of Cupps and Bellesfield and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 5 and 7-9 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 5 and 7-9.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 107156-00051.

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz
319275_1.DOC